
ICANN78 | AGM – Joint Session ICANN Board and ALAC
Monday, October 23, 2023 – 3:00 to 4:00 HAM

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello. And welcome, everybody, to the joint meeting between the ICANN Board and the At-Large Advisory Committee. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for the session will include six UN languages which are Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, and English. You may click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language that you wish to listen to during the session.

Please note that this discussion will be between the ICANN Board and the ALAC members only. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience today. However, all participants may make comments in the chat. You may just use the drop-down menu in the chat pod and select Respond to All Panelists and Attendees. This will allow everyone to view your comments.

With that, I will now hand the floor over to the ICANN Board Chairwoman, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Welcome, everyone, to our first bilateral session with the ALAC. As you know, these are very important discussions that we have at these sessions. This is an opportunity for us to exchange ideas and

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

understand where the pressure points are, and other similar items. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to the chair, León.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Tripti. Thanks, everyone, for being with us. It's great to be, again, in this joint meeting with ALAC. Of course, we're here with Jonathan Zuck, the current ALAC, and some ALAC members.

So I think in the evolution of these joint meetings, it's good to keep them as a dialogue as opposed to having what we have called the scripted session. So I would like to ask Jonathan, how would you like to proceed?

We have some questions that have been posed by the ALAC, and we have also sent our questions to you. So I suggest that instead of concentrating on going through the full list of questions from our side to you and vice versa, why don't we go one-on-one so that we can better use this time to exchange topics and ideas? Would that work for you?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure, León. And this is not scripted at all. No, I'm a fan of throwing out the script, as you well know.

Before we get started, I wanted to present Tripti and Sally with commemorative 20th-anniversary pins. We're celebrating the 20th anniversary of the ALAC, and our metaphor for our anniversary is "The Little Engine That Could," which is a very popular children's book. And the most popular phrase from it is, "I think I can. I think I can." And if you think about it, it sounds a little bit like "I think ICANN."

And so at the bottom of the pin, it says "I know ICANN." So that's the reference. So please wear them with pride. And, yeah, let's go informal here.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Good. Thank you. Thank you, Jonathan. Well, of course, happy 20th anniversary to the At-Large community and to the ALAC.

And, well, the first question or the first topic that you submitted to the Board is on clarifying or seeking clarification on domain abuse activity reporting to DAAR and its evolution given the new tools that are being developed. And for that, I believe, Jim, you can share with us some things.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And just to clarify, the reason we have this question is that we recently got the report from the Board on the disposition of some DNS abuse-related recommendations that came out of the CCT and SSR2 Reviews. And while it wasn't explicit, the justifications and some of the text in those Board decisions seem to indicate kind of a de-emphasis of DAAR and less of a focus on its growth and things than we had seen previously. And there was, at one point, going to be a public comment, and then that didn't happen. And so I think that those things together is what led to the general question.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you. And thank you for the additional context. I appreciate that. And let me also first thank you in advance for your interest in DAAR.

DAAR was originally created to be a resource to the community, and it's great to see that you're supportive of that and paying attention to it and all of the elements that contribute to it. So that's a good thing.

The Board is equally supportive of DAAR—we continue to be—and, of course, its evolution as it grows and increases its opportunity to be a continuing resource to the community. Let me broaden your question just a little bit, if you don't mind, and not cover DAAR, specifically, but DNS abuse more generally, and let you know about two additional activities that are going on in this space. And then I'll say a little something about the evolution of DAAR.

ICANN is very active in trying to provide resources to the community studies, elements that will help all of us to understand DNS abuse. They have certainly been looking at domain name data in zone files broadly to report out to the community on the TAC surface that presents to registries and registrars.

One of the things that they observed is that there are domains that can be easily classified into categories: inactive and active, or part. And what's useful about these categories of understanding domain names that have been registered is that they have different threats, different threat models in active domains. And so they present different opportunities for bad guys in the world.

And what OCTO has done in this particular space is publish a research paper in a peer-reviewed conference. And it's currently just recently been published. The IEEE Security and Privacy European Conference 2023. So that's continuing progress in studying DNS abuse generally.

Another thing, and this is sort of a baseline that goes with DAAR, is understanding and evaluating reputation block list data generally. There's a lot of varying opinions about the quality of reputation block list data, and it's important to understand that it is provided by third parties not by ICANN. But certainly, ICANN takes advantage of the reputation block list data, and it does use it as part of what it does within DAAR.

One of the things that they've done is to design and create some metrics for evaluating these reputation block lists in multiple dimensions. So it allows people at large to take advantage of whether or not they want to use some of these reputation block lists. They certainly do have their role.

And this work has also been published. It's available on the 2023 eCrime Conference, and so there's a reference for folks to go out and get access to that and see what ICANN has done on behalf of the community.

And then, finally, to answer your question more directly, certainly ICANN is working towards creating a measurement platform, so something larger and broader than just DAAR, to collect multiple points of information about domain names including the threat and abuse information that DAAR does seem to provide today. They're going to make that available in terms of the data statistics and visuals to the community so it's easily consumable in a variety of different forms for different purposes.

The platform itself will be built in a modular way. And this is important because the first module will be DAAR, so that will be incorporated into it, and we'll get to see that as part of this module. And then in the future,

they'll add other metrics including uptime metrics for domains, classification of maliciously registered domains versus compromised, among other things.

But those are the topics that are top of mind at the moment. So they're currently working on the finalization of requirements for this additional work so that they can begin kicking off implementation real soon.

Certainly, DAAR and DNS abuse information and a resource is top of mind for ICANN as well as the Board, and we appreciate ALAC paying attention to that and making that visible for others. Thanks.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thanks, Jim. Jonathan, I don't know if you want to make any remarks on that, or any of the ALAC colleagues that are here with us.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think I drew the short straw on this topic, so others will be following up on others. Is this rethinking of it as a broader modular system part of why the launch of DAAR 2.0 was postponed are consumed into something else? I remember at one point hearing that it was going to have something else that we have called for in the past, which is some kind of usable predictive analytics that might be of use to registrars, for example. But I don't know what the evolution of that has been.

So I'm just kind of curious. Is DAAR not going to be DAAR anymore, but just a module of this broader DNS statistics system that you're talking about?

JIM GALVIN: So you're asking a very specific question that I honestly don't know the specific answer to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

JIM GALVIN: But what I can say is, with respect to the registrar part that you mentioned which I did not actually include in my response, yes, the intent of DAAR, one of the progressive moves on it is to include listing registrars as well as registries. And that was part of the original DAAR 2.0 form. So I know that that's continuing. I honestly don't know what the names are. And I was looking around out here to see if anyone from OCTO—Samaneh, in particular—was there who might want to add to that if you're interested, if we could get those details. But—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I don't mean to ask a pedestrian question at all.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, what it's called or whatever. There was some notion that DAAR was going to include technology for the registrar. So this is less about listing them, but that would provide at least some sort of baseline functionality for predictive analytics associated with potential

malicious registrations. And I don't know if GDPR screwed that up or if it's still a plan.

But again, I'm asking you a more specific question than you're ready for. But that's something that we've been interested in as we've talked about this. So I just put that back out there as a thought point.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Thank you for the question. But, yeah, you're asking something that I'm not prepared to answer and don't know the details of. That's really internal to ICANN and the department.

SALLY COSTERTON: [inaudible].

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Sally's telling me here over here on the side that they will produce an answer and make that available to you. Thank you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Jim.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: And I see Edmon. Do you want to comment?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Mic two, please. Can that be open?

EDMON CHUNG: I just want to add to what Jim has said. At least from the Board, from my perspective, I don't think DAAR is being phased out. It's being built upon to further.

And a couple of things. One is that, in fact, I'm really hoping that the report can come out soon because some of this DAAR data is being used for understanding abuse on IDNs as well, which gives us a different perspective to some of the data. So that data is certainly important.

And the other thing is, I do believe that without the measure, it's hard to see how we do. In fact, if you look back a little bit, we've shown, especially [Göran] likes to show how it went down a bit. The way that I see it is that the things we measure then gets actually acted upon, and therefore we can mitigate.

But there are other things. Right? That's why we want to not really expand but develop the DAAR and develop a platform so that we measure things. And then with the measurements then come mitigations that actually work. I think that's what I want to add.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Edmon.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thanks, Edmon. So, Jonathan, following this dynamic of going one question and one question, I would like to ask our first question to the

ALAC. What is your view on RVCs and their enforceability in line with ICANN's mission? This is a big discussion that is happening towards, or looking to the future next round of gTLDs, and I think it's important that you give us that input and what are your thoughts and your position on these RVCs and their enforceability.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, León. I'm going to hand things over to Joanna here before too long. But to have the pleasure of the simple answer, I'm going to say that there's definitely broad consensus within the At-Large community that if something is in the contract, it needs to be enforced. And so that concedes the possibility that there are challenges. That concedes the possibilities that there might be RVCs that are unenforceable and therefore shouldn't find their way into contracts.

But I think as a mechanism to address concerns that are raised by the GAC or ALAC or others, RVCs are invaluable, and we need to find a solution to deal with some of those issues. And I've heard some interesting proposals, in fact, from Becky about some sort of objectification of the objective measure of compliance with an RVC that uses a third party or some other objective measures so that ICANN doesn't need to develop domain expertise it otherwise wouldn't. And I think that those are legitimate issues.

But I think as the At-Large community, as in users, we're not lawyers, and we're not probably the people that are going to solve this problem. But we do feel strongly that if something's in the contract, it needs to be enforced because, otherwise, it invalidates the notion of the contract itself.

Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA: Great. Thank you. I'm glad to follow up with the answer to that question, if you wish me to do so, Jonathan. I believe I would also be comfortable with the second question from the At-Large. But I'm glad to follow up on the RVCs if that's your preference. Should I do that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just because that's what they asked.

JOANNA KULESZA: Right, right. Okay, let's do that. So there is a formulated response from the ALAC. Please let me just follow up with that one. While the At-Large understands that this question is to be read in the context of several interrelated planes, we would firstly like to note that the term "voluntary" in the Registry Voluntary Commitments, or the RVCs, refers to the commitment being volunteered by a gTLD applicant. And which, if they were successful in the application process, would then be incorporated as a contractual obligation in the Registry Agreement, presumably under the Specification 11.

Now in this context, "voluntary" does not mean that ICANN won't enforce the commitment further. A commitment being volunteered by a gTLD applicant would not be one that is mandated under ICANN consensus policies are under the GAC Category 1 Safeguards Framework, the latter having already been adopted by the Board through SubPro affirmation 9.3.

Secondly, we are aware of there being two schools of thought where the first lands on the argument that ICANN should not accept any commitment which purports to regulate content, something which clearly falls outside the ICANN mission per the ICANN Bylaws Section 1.1 (c).

Now, the second school of thought, which finds its basis in the ICANN Bylaws Section 1.1 (d), says that any commitment which is included in a Registry Agreement may not be challenged on the basis that such terms and conditions conflict with or are in violation of ICANN's mission or otherwise exceed the scope of ICANN's authority or powers.

Now, the ALAC is firmly in the camp of the second school of thought which, in other words, means any RVC that is taken up in a Registry Agreement can and must be enforceable. Otherwise, there is no reason or value to have an RVC in the Registry Agreement. This would include any RVCs that touch on restrictions or limitations to content to be published by the registrants in line with the reasons expounded by the applicant as to the purpose for which the gTLD is to be operated. Hence, the bottom line, RVCs must be enforceable and must be enforced.

And then thirdly, in understanding the [crux] of the Board's question, which is the practicability of enforcing an RVC, the ALAC believes that so long as any RVC is accompanied with a clear description of how to assess whether the RVC is being complied with or, conversely, what would be deemed as a violation of the RVC, then that provides a way for ICANN to assess an audit for compliance and to enforce if noncompliance was established.

The assessment mechanism offered by an applicant could vary from case to case. The important thing is that it is reasonable and can be feasibly and objectively measured by ICANN. And this is where community inputs and support may prove useful.

At the end of the day, we do not expect ICANN to be unduly burdened with having to staff its Contractual Compliance department in order to monitor compliance over and above what they are currently doing. The only complication might be the need to customize part of the scope of audits that ICANN Contractual Compliance undertakes to meet the assessment mechanism proposed by the applicant.

However, we understand that this is something that ICANN Contractual Compliance already does in regards to Additional Public Interest Commitments, APICs, that are in a gTLD Registry Agreement Specification 11 from the previous round. An example being the publication of an acceptable use policy.

Lastly, we understand that RVCs will, by virtue of SubPro Recommendation 9.11, be open to the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Procedure if an [aggravated] party's complaint to the registry operator were somewhat not resolved satisfactorily. In this respect, there is a need to examine the efficacy of the PICDRP in terms of true accessibility, notwithstanding need for evidence of harm and standard of proof in conducting a review of the PICDRP.

That's the proposed response. Thank you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you, Joanna. Good. So is there anyone else who wants to comment or say something and follow up with this? No? Okay. Well, thanks so much for your input. I'm pretty sure that it's going to be taken into account when time comes and be useful for us to have these views from the ALAC.

Now, to the second question from the ALAC to the Board, which kind of goes along with RVCs and contracting and the issues of contract. We have the second question. What is the Board's opinion on the contractual amendments to the Base Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement that are being negotiated between the Contracted Party House and ICANN Org in strengthening DNS abuse mitigation?

And for that, I'll pass it on to Becky.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you. And greetings, everybody. The Board is extremely supportive of the leadership that the Registries Stakeholder Group and the Registrars took in bringing these amendments forward. They were deliberately focused on adding meaningful enforceability to the requirements that are in the contract now. They're narrow, but the focus was on getting real enforcement.

As you know, those amendments are out for votes now. We are very much encouraging all of the registrars and registries to get their votes in so that can move forward. And we're very hopeful. It's been actually a lot accomplished in a pretty small amount of time, really. I think about six months.

So there were some questions about comment periods and that kind of thing, and I think we said from the beginning that there are two ways to impose obligations on registries and registrars. One is through contract negotiations between ICANN and the Contracted Parties, and the other is through policy development processes.

And the concept has been, all along, that once the contract amendments are in place, they could be followed up with a series of micro-PDPs. And again, the Board is very supportive of those, whatever comes of them. Of course, it's a new thing. We don't know exactly what a micro-PDP means. And we have a policy development process that's laid out in the Bylaws, so it has to fit into that framework.

I don't think it allows us to skip steps, but to the extent that the point of the micro-PDPs is to really focus on narrow issues and work on the scoping, that's a tremendous thing. We had indicated when the contract amendments were rolled out that they were agreements between Org and the Contracted Parties, but that once they were in place, there's plenty of opportunities to talk more broadly about what's needed going forward.

And I just wanted to say one thing on the previous question about DAAR and DNS abuse. I'm not paid by the DNS Abuse Institute. I have nothing to do with the DNS Abuse Institute, but I do want to commend the work that they're doing on this and really strongly suggest that people take a look at their Compass reports. They have phenomenal analytics and a lot of really useful information, I think.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thanks, Becky. Jonathan, any reactions or any comments on what we just heard?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. That all makes sense. I think we're hoping for the vote to go well on those amendments and for Contract Compliance to have some more tools to deal with the people we vaguely refer to as bad actors, I guess. So everything's just another increment, I think, in that direction. So thank you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thanks, Jonathan. So our next question is Board to the ALAC. What is your view regarding assessing the human rights respect when selecting meeting venues, as these criteria or the criteria developed by the Meeting Strategy Working Group does not currently include human rights considerations? So we would like to listen to your views and your opinions on this matter.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I will do the answer. I don't know if I can speak in Spanish just to take—

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: I'm not sure if there is interpretation.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Okay. If there isn't interpretation [other than] English—

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Not saying that there isn't. I'm just not sure. I'm just asking. Do we have interpretation?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Yes, we do. So you can speak in Spanish.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you. Just to take advantage of this. Ricardo Holmquist, At-Large member. ALAC supports the concept of selecting different places based on human rights. The problem is how we measure them and which human rights. Where we draw the line on what human rights we are respecting and which ones we don't. So it becomes a complex question when there is no precise measure of who respects and who does not.

In some countries, we have parts of a country respecting it. Some others don't. There are countries that take for granted that there are no LGBTQ rights, and it's okay for them. And it agrees with the way they are. And there are countries that is just the opposite. We're to take this 167 countries represented here, [what be complex] for some. And for some others, it's part of their culture.

If we want to have one world, one Internet, however, it's complicated not to get to the countries, and that could be the way to bridge gaps with those countries and cultures and integrate them into this one world, one Internet concept. From our standpoint, we kick the ball again to ICANN Org. And what we say is: we do agree that we need to

move forward with human rights where ICANN meets based on human rights. But there needs to be a clear policy of what human rights, and to draw lines on how that red line that we don't want to cross.

We suggest that ICANN Org as an organization needs to be based on some existing measures such as the UN and the Human Rights Index of the UN. And we have two indices that can be picked up as a baseline so that there is not starting the job and kicking the ball on forward to ICANN to conduct a human rights assessment. But to start there and having the Org saying, "We're thinking of these places because these places are doing rather well in the human rights policy," or "We're going to go to this place because we believe we can bridge the gap there or not."

Thank you very much. I don't know whether there is any other question on this regard.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Ricardo. I did not have my headset on. I hope I understood you. I can say that Hadia wants to add something. Hadia, if you would, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. Just a quick thought. So not taking human rights into consideration when selecting venues might send the wrong message and might raise ethical concerns. However, ICANN's mission is purely technical and operational, or primarily technical and operational. So ICANN's mission focuses on the smooth functioning of the Internet. And

now trying to get involved into broader policy issues and human rights issues might be problematic.

However, having said so, ICANN is a multistakeholder model, and decisions need to be taken based on the input of the multistakeholder model. As Sally mentioned today, there are more than 170-something countries represented in this meeting. And thus, also, the selection of the venues could be based on community consensus rather than getting involved into broader policy and human rights issues that could drag ICANN in a direction that maybe it doesn't want to go there. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. I just want to remind folks. This isn't a public forum. So I think we don't want to get into a place of just turning it into a [conversation]. But let's put it on the agenda for the public forum, potentially, to get individual opinions. We were just asked where the ALAC was on this, and we had some conversations that are suitably vague in their resolution at this point.

So I think all those points are valid, but we probably aren't trying to get to a open conversation about this at this point, probably. So I recommend the Board, since they're interested, I'd recommend they put it on the public forum agenda.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thanks, Jonathan. Sally, you want to comment on this. Right?

SALLY COSTERTON:

I think Jonathan's right. I suggest we pick this back up later in the week because there is a lot to say on this subject. My only point, I just wanted to correct something Hadia said. I didn't want there to be a misunderstanding.

The question was to us from the Board community: what do you think? How does the committee think, or how does the At-Large community think we should assess this because it is not in the current policy? That does not mean that in the organization's work, when it looks at venues, we do not consider human rights. We have a whole list of issues on our website of the different issues we do look at when we select venues.

So I just wanted to make a point of clarity. It felt to me like it was beginning to sound like we just ignore it, and that's not true. But it's not currently in the policy, so I suggest it comes back for the public forum.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you, Sally. I'm going to speak in Spanish again. And this is precisely the spirit of the question, Ricardo, as we acknowledge this is not currently in the policy. We need your help so that all of us together in the spirit we use in ICANN to get orientation and help from the community so that together we can determine the criteria, the measures, these guidelines that will support us so that in the future we can conduct an impact analysis as to human rights. And that will help us draw the line that will mark the division of the places we can go to the venues to hold our meetings. And those that do not meet human rights respect standards then could not be considered to hold our meetings.

But again, it's something that even when it's being considered, as Sally said, and it's always been there. It's also true that there is no measure, as you're saying, and there we need your support to create criteria/policy so as to be clearer and more certain in the future as to where to hold our meetings.

And I see that Edmon wants to add something. Edmon, you have the floor.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, León. And adding to, really, what León just mentioned, I think the question from the Board is really twofold. One is: we know that the current policy doesn't include that. But me and multiple Board members want to push for that. This is a regular part of assessing the venues into the future.

In between the first question, in fact, with this is: do you feel it's the right thing to do for us to push for that and make sure that's in place in absence of the policy?

And the second question is exactly what you brought up. For a longer term, perhaps there needs to be a more in-depth community discussion about it. On that note, how do we start that? Where do we start that conversation?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

There's so much [thinking] the policy was not applicable. The Meeting Strategy Working Group, what we are doing it's not what it's [inaudible], therefore. No, I am not allowed to go to the mic.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Good. Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes. To answer [Andrew], yes, the very first phrase of my answer was: ALAC supports the concept of selecting venues and contracts with human rights respect. And this is the first answer: yes, we do that. We do support that, and we do support inclusion of the human rights in the matrix of selecting countries. Yes.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you, Ricardo. I see Sarah also wants to add something.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah. I just wanted to raise an example of the intersection of considering this issue, not in the abstract, but perhaps there could be examples where countries may have human rights issues such that participants aren't able to freely speak and participate as they would in the meeting. Or there could be issues where human rights actually intersects with the physical safety and security of participants by speaking freely. So those are some of the issues we're curious about and concerned about.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thanks. Jonathan, you wanted to comment?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, thanks. And I'm speaking personally right now because this is an evolving discussion, and so this isn't something we spent a lot of time talking about or reached ALAC complete consensus on. But I think Sarah's right that one possible lens through which to view the human rights issue is in fact the meetings themselves and the availability of the meeting spaces, the safety of the meeting spaces.

And I think another component of that has to do with visa practices as well. If there are things that are preventing people from participating in meetings, then that's a right that's of particular importance of this group that everybody who wants to is able to participate. And we have such a diverse group as part of the At-Large community, and we're plagued by the visa issues, perhaps more than any other community within ICANN.

And so I think that's something that makes sense to consider as part of this, which may exclude my home country. But I think that's something that needs to be a part of a consideration, is the ability to assemble.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thanks, Jonathan. Good. So anyone else want to say something?

PAULO ROQUE:

Yes, may I?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Is he an ALAC member?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My name is Paulo Roque. I'm the president of the Brazilian Software Association, ABES. We—

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Yes, thank you. I'm sorry to interrupt, but are you an ALAC member?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: No?

PAULO ROQUE: No.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Okay. So my apologies, but we are only having the meeting between the ALAC members.

PAULO ROQUE: Okay, I was not aware of that. Okay.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: But you're welcome, of course, to raise your questions or concerns in the public forum later in this week. Thank you.

PAULO ROQUE: Okay. I'll do it later. Thank you very much.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you. Good. So our next question is: which measures would you propose to make ICANN a more sustainable and eco-friendly organization? And this is, of course, a question from the Board to the ALAC. We want to, again, take advantage of this hive mind, I think is the right expression, and to crowdsource these ideas because we are mindful that this is a subject that has been beginning to be on top of everyone's mind.

There is an important part of the community that's pushing towards a more sustainable organization. And also within the Board, we have a group of Board members, if not the full Board, committed to having a more sustainable organization. So we would love to hear your thoughts and ideas on how we can achieve this goal.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Marita Moll is going to be our designated speaker on this, and she'll be speaking Canadian. So put your headphones on.

MARITA MOLL: Yes. I will end every sentence with a little inflection that says "eh?" No. Thank you. León, you're absolutely right. It's such a timely question. I

have to say I've been to so many meetings lately where this is coming up. The most recent IGF I was monitoring virtually, which was at the high level, was this panel. And that was coming up. How are we putting environmental sustainability goals in? So, yeah, very timely. And I am assuming that what you mean by "sustainable" here is eco-sustainable. Yeah? Good.

I have to tell this little story. When I first started going to meetings, the way you distributed water was there was a jug and some glasses on the table, of water. And then bottles appeared. We just moved to some of these things which now represent the way we do it, but there are more sustainable ways of delivering water.

And I remember a friend of mine who, at that time was from India, who picked up his bottle of water. And he said, "To me, that's kind of a sign of a third-world country." This is Canada. Right? You can drink the water there. But anyway, just a little story.

I think that we talked about this and thought, you know, there's lots of little ways you can address this. You can do it by not having bottles of water, or you can do it by planting a tree or letting go of one flight or another. But the real way to address this is an enterprise-wide solution, really. You have to look at the way ICANN is operating as an organization.

And it's the time to come look at this organization through an eco-friendly lens which we're not all used to doing yet totally. Maybe a little bit, but not totally. It's a complex thing. It involves eco audits that would have to be routine, specific measures that are set to establish whether certain activities meet the established goals.

We're talking a lot about measurement. And here's another one. One thing that came up in our community was tools like ISO 14000 process, which is an environmental management system that companies use. It's really a lifecycle of product kind of system. And whether or not it could be made to fit for purpose here. Maybe it could, but it's the sort of thing that maybe could be looked at as a way of addressing this problem.

But indeed, it would have to be done in terms of looking at ICANN and its multistakeholder model which operates all around the world. So whether or not this kind of a system could be made to fit, we don't know. But maybe it wouldn't have to completely start from scratch, and maybe there are places out there that could help ICANN establish some kind of an enterprise-wide solution, at least even starting small.

So that's kind of a question back to you. Is any of this going on now? Is ICANN looking at those types of situations?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Marita. It's a great time to be having this conversation because after a lot of discussion in the community and at the Board, I decided, I recommended in conjunction with the Board team that León referred to that now is the time to put a goal on the CEO goals specifically around this. So the answer is, yes, that is now in the FY24 goals.

And what we will do is initiate the development or comprehensive approach implementing an environmental sustainability strategy for ICANN. So I wanted to just say this doesn't mean we will never do more

than that, but we had a long discussion about: where do you start, which is exactly what you said. You start thinking about, "Well, could we start here? Could we do this? Could we do that?"

And we had exactly this discussion. We said, "Well, we think we should use our facilitation powers, if you like, to put together a recommendation as to how we tackle this." So the action will be that we will start that process using staff resources, which is why it's a CEO goal. We will also work with a subgroup on the Board.

We will also act as a point of convening, if you like, for interested members of the community so that we get ideas. And as the framework evolves, we will share it, we'll discuss it, and we'll sharpen it. And then we'll publish it. And then out of that will come a plan, if that makes sense.

So also, the other point I wanted to make is that that process will also inform, which you had—I don't know if you were and the earlier session, but [Savea Kavos] was talking about that next Five-Year Strategic Plan. Yes. We want to make sure that the work that's done on that goal directly gets put into that planning discussion so that we're not missing anything and that it's not sitting in a silo.

So thank you for the question, and thank you for the discussion. I'm very encouraged to hear that there's so much appetite for this. It feels like the time is right to do this.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you, Sally. And I know Maarten wants to add something.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Importantly, so. And we did start this discussion on the Board and with the Org, which resulted in this. We're also very cognizant that there is, in a way, three aspects. One is the impact of the Internet on the world. And there, you may know that on the IETF lists, there are discussions on green and that. What is not on the IETF list yet is what the positive impact is from the Internet on supporting the role to be more sustainable. And I believe that's big, too.

But that's not our [inaudible]. We might contribute to that. That's not what we do. Then we have what we at Board and Org can do in our operations to facilitate. And the measuring that Sally said this is crucial there because we may think we know, but we don't. And we need to know. These bottles are environment-friendly, apparently. So they're better than other plastic bottles, but I don't know what that means. And measuring helps. So this is why that is so important.

The third factor is, one thing where we cannot determine where the balance is, is how eco-friendly will we be and have the multistakeholder systems still working. This is where we need to look at the community to take the lead to help us find that balance. And the organization will inform that again by the best measures they can provide. I hope that makes sense.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Thank you for sort of enhancing that, which we have to do it within the lens, also, of the multistakeholder model. And that just makes it a thousand times more complex but not undoable. But, yeah,

time to start is now, and that's great. And who knows? That might even be more sustainable than the jug of water and the glass.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Just to jump in briefly, if I may, off the record. To put our actions where our words are, EURALO's organizing a focus session on the impact of new infrastructures on the multistakeholder community. But there clearly is, and will be discussed, an environmental impact. So the more infrastructures we have, we hope for them to be governed in a multistakeholder manner to decrease the potential environmental impact.

So just to highlight that that is a topic of importance not just for the Board but for the At-Large itself, and we are already organizing a bottom-up initiative to raise awareness about the issue. Thank you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Marita, Joanna, Maarten. Is there anyone else who wants to comment on this or add something? Okay. No? Good.

So I see a hand here, but I don't know who is—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible].

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Please go to the mic. That's Pari.

PARI ESFANDIARI: I wanted to mention that since last year, a group of us being a number of people from ALAC and also some other people from cross-community sections have been getting together about Sustainable Development Goals, and we communicated with ICANN. So we have several meetings, and still we continue. We have developed an agenda and objectives, and we are continuing this conversation.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thank you very much, Pari.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Pari. I think you've been working with some of my staff team, and we'll continue to do that. And that was actually what I was thinking about when I said, well, I know there's a lot of community interest. And we want to make sure that we're coordinating, not working in silos. And we actually had a meeting about it last night. So thank you for that reminder, but it's certainly important.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Thanks, Sally. Good. So that literally has exhausted our agenda for today.

Jonathan, I'm happy. I think it's the first joint meeting in which we actually addressed all the topics that we both had in the agenda. So I think this dynamic works, going one on one? And I thank you all for being here. I thank my Board colleagues, the ALAC colleagues.

And, Jonathan, if you want to do any closing remarks, you are welcome, of course.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, León. We always value the opportunity to speak with the Board directly and raise concerns. We know that, often, there's other parts of ICANN that are ultimately responsible for execution of so many things, and so we get to have strategic discussions with the Board, which I think is useful.

But I will, inspired by Joanna, take the opportunity to say that we have three plenary sessions during the meeting that you might find interesting. One is the one that EURALO is sponsoring that Joanna mentioned. One is one that Hadia is running on new technologies. And one, Marita is producing that's related to WSIS+20 and the implications for that and what our messaging should be for that. So I recommend all three of those plenary discussions.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you, Jonathan. And for the record, this was not scripted at all, so I think we're progressing on that. Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]